1	ROBERT W. BROWNLIE (Bar No. C KELLIN M. CHATFIELD (Bar No. C	CA-138793) A-288389)
2	KELLIN M. CHATFIELD (Bar No. C DLA PIPER LLP (US)	,
3	401 B Street, Suite 1700 San Diego, CA 92101-4297 Tel: 619.699.2700	
4	Fax: 619.699.2701	
5	Attorneys for Defendants GEMINI REAL ESTATE ADVISORS	STIC.
6	GEMINI EAST WEST S LLC; GEMI WEST H, LLC; GEMINI EAST WES	NI EAST
7	GEMINI ACQUISITION COMPANY GEMINI PROPERTY MANAGEMEN	, INC.;
8	GEMINI INVESTORS, LLC; WILLIA OBEID; and DANTE A. MASSARO	AM T.
9	ODEID, and DANTE A. MASSAKO	
10	UNITED STAT	ES DISTRICT COURT
11	CENTRAL DIST	RICT OF CALIFORNIA
12	MOHAN KUMAR AND AKILA KUMAR, husband and wife and as	
13	sole members of Gemini East West I, LLC; NATALIJA JOSIMOVICH,	CASE NO. 2:14-cv-07474
14	individually and as sole member of	
15	Gemini East West 2, LLC; JOHN O'CARROLL, individually and as sole member of Gemini East West 4,	NOTICE OF REMOVAL OF ACTION UNDER 28 U.S.C. §1441(a)
16	LLC; CAROL TANNER, individually and as sole member of	(FEDERAL QUESTION) BY DEFENDANTS GEMINI REAL
17	Gemini East West 5, LLC; KRZYSZTOF	ESTATE ADVISORS LLC; GEMINI EAST WEST S LLC; GEMINI EAST
18	ZACHARIASIEWICZ, individually and as sole member of Gemini East	WEST H, LLC; GEMINI EAST WEST M, LLC; GEMINI
19	West 6, LLC; DAVID MILANI, individually and as sole member of	ACQUISITION COMPANY, INC.; GEMINI PROPERTY
20	Gemini East West 7, LLC; THOMAS MCGARVEY,	MANAGEMENT, LLC; GEMINI INVESTORS, LLC; WILLIAM T.
21	individually and as sole member of Gemini East West 8, LLC; BYRON	OBEID; AND DANTE A. MASSARO
22	REALTY I CORPORATION as sole member of Gemini East West 9,	
23	LLC; DAVID C. SUTHERLAND, individually and as sole member of	
24	Gemini East West 10, LLC, PEI LIN HUANG, individually and as sole	
25	member of Gemini East West 11, LLC; PAULINE KEELER,	
26	individually and as sole member of	
27	Gemini East West 12, LLC; JAMES R. KEE AND ANNE M. KEE, husband and wife and as sole	
28	musuanu anu whe anu as sole	

WEST\250464095.1

1	members of Gemini East West 13,
2	LLC; RICHARD O. WAHLGREN, individually and as sole member of
3	Gemini East West 14, LLC; BRYCE E. KENNEDY, JR., individually and
4	as sole member of Gemini East West
	15, LLC; DAVID GIBSON AND BETTY HOOD GIBSON, husband
5	and wife and as sole members of H.G. Financial Services, LLC and
6	Gemini East West 16, LLC; JOHN W. MCCORMICK, individually and
7	as sole member of Gemini East West 20, LLC; ROBERT AND
8	CATHRYN BAIRD, husband and
9	wife, individually and as sole members of Gemini East West 21,
10	LLC,
11	Plaintiffs,
12	V.
13	RBS FINANCIAL PRODUCTS INC., F/K/A GREENWICH
14	CAPÍTAL FINANCIAL PRODUCTS, INC.; RBS
15	SECURITIES INC., F/K/A GREENWICH CAPITAL
16	MARKETS, INC.; GREENWICH CAPITAL COMMERCIAL
17	FUNDING CORPORATION;
	BANK OF AMERICA CORPORATION, F/K/A LASALLE
18	BANK NATIONAL ASSOCIATION AS TRUSTEE,
19	FOR "GREENWICH CAPITAL COMMERCIAL FUNDING CORP.,
20	COMMERCIAL MORTGAGE TRUST 2007 GG11,
21	COMMERCIAL MORTGAGE PASS THROUGH CERTIFICATES,
22	SERIES 2007-GG11"; GCCFC 2007
23	CONNECTOR RETAIL LIMITED PARTNERSHIP; GEMINI REAL
24	ESTATE ADVISORS LLC; GEMINI EAST WEST S LLC;
25	GEMINI EAST WEST H, LLC; GEMINI EAST WEST M, LLC;
26	GEMINI ACQUISITION COMPANY, INC.; GEMINI_
27	PROPERTY MANAGEMENT, LLC; GEMINI INVESTORS, LLC;
28	WILLIAM T. OBEID, individually; DANTE A. MASSARO,
20	WESTV25(M640)95 1

DLA PIPER LLP (US)
SAN DIEGO

TO THE CLERK OF THE ABOVE-ENTITLED COURT AND	TO ALL
PARTIES AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:	

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE THAT PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. §1441,
DEFENDANTS GEMINI REAL ESTATE ADVISORS LLC; GEMINI EAST
WEST S LLC; GEMINI EAST WEST H, LLC; GEMINI EAST WEST M, LLC;
GEMINI ACQUISITION COMPANY, INC.; GEMINI PROPERTY
MANAGEMENT, LLC; GEMINI INVESTORS, LLC; WILLIAM T. OBEID; and
DANTE A. MASSARO (the "Gemini Defendants"), by their undersigned attorneys,
hereby remove the above-entitled state court action, Case No. BC555255, from the
Superior Court of the State of California, County of Los Angeles to the United
State District Court for the Central District of California on the basis of federal
question jurisdiction. In support of this Notice of Removal, said Defendants state
as follows:

## I. THE STATE COURT ACTION

The removed action was filed on or about August 20, 2014 in the Superior Court of the State of California in the County of Los Angeles, entitled *Mohan Kumar and Akila Kumar, et al., v. RBS Financial Products Inc., et al.*, and assigned Case No. BC555255. The allegations in the Complaint relate to the sale and management of tenancy-in-common ("TIC") interests. The Complaint asserts causes of action under Section 10(b) and Rule 10b-5 of the Exchange Act of 1934 and Violations of the federal Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act Sections 1961-68, as well as causes of action for negligence, negligent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, breach of contract, conversion, promissory fraud, violation of California Civil Remedies Act, violation of the California Financial Elder Abuse-Welfare and Institution Code §15600 et seq., breach of the covenant of good faith and fair dealing and violation of California Civil Code §1575, equitable estoppel, actual and constructive fraud, breach of implied warranty, aiding and abetting breach of fiduciary duty, aiding and abetting west; and a setting breach of fiduciary duty, aiding and abetting west; and a setting breach of fiduciary duty, aiding and abetting west; and a setting breach of fiduciary duty, aiding and abetting west; and a setting breach of fiduciary duty, aiding and abetting west; and a setting breach of fiduciary duty, aiding and abetting west; and a setting breach of fiduciary duty, aiding and abetting west; and a setting breach of fiduciary duty, aiding and abetting west; and a setting breach of fiduciary duty, aiding and abetting west; and a setting breach of fiduciary duty, aiding and abetting west; and a setting breach of fiduciary duty, aiding and abetting west; and a setting breach of fiduciary duty, aiding and abetting west; and a setting breach of fiduciary duty, aiding and abetting west; and a setting breach of fiduciary duty, aiding and abetting breach of fiduciary duty.

1	torts, declaratory relief, violation of California Business & Professions Code	
2	§ 17200, violations of California securities and corporate law, conspiracy,	
3	concealment, violation of California Penal Code 496, deceit, and equitable estoppel	
4	relating to defendant asserting statute of limitations. As required by 28 U.S.C.	
5	§ 1446(a), attached are copies of all state court process, pleadings and orders served	
6	upon Gemini Defendants in the removed case. (See Exhibit A.)	
7	II. BASIS FOR REMOVAL – FEDERAL QUESTIONS JURISDICTION	
8	This case is properly removed under 28 U.S.C. § 1441 because it is a civil	
9	action that falls within the Court's original jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1331.	
10	Plaintiffs' Complaint asserts a cause of action under Section 10(b) and Rule 10b-5	
11	of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (the "Exchange Act"). The federal courts	
12	have exclusive jurisdiction over all claims arising under the Exchange Act. 15	
13	U.S.C. § 78aa. The Complaint is also based on alleged violations of the federal	
14	Racketeer Influenced & Corrupt Organizations Act ("RICO"), 18 U.S.C. §1961-68.	
15	Federal courts have original jurisdiction over civil RICO claims under 18 U.S.C.	
16	§ 1964(c). Since this action alleges claims over which the federal courts have	
17	original jurisdiction, it is properly removable under 28 U.S.C. § 1441.	
18	Plaintiffs' Complaint also contains 22 related common law claims and claims	
19	based upon California statutes. These common law claims are based upon the same	
20	allegations underlying the Exchange Act and RICO claims. Gemini Defendants,	
21	therefore, respectfully request that the Court exercise supplemental jurisdiction over	
22	the common law claims under 28 U.S.C. §1367(a).	
23	III. THE PROCEDURAL REQUIREMENTS FOR REMOVAL ARE	
24	SATISFIED	
25	Plaintiffs commenced this action on August 20, 2014, and served process on	
26	Gemini Defendants on August 25, 2014. This Notice of Removal is therefore	
27	timely filed within 30 days of service of the initial pleading. 28 U.S.C. § 1446(b).	

All defendants, who the Gemini Defendants have been able to

1	determine have been properly served, join in and consent to removal. Defendants
2	Bank of America Corporation [f/k/a/ LaSalle Bank National Association as Trustee
3	for "Greenwich Capital Commercial Funding Corp., Commercial Mortgage Trust
4	2007 GG11, Commercial Mortgage Pass Through Certificates, Series 2007-GG11"]
5	(the "Trust") <sup>1</sup> and GCCFC 2007 Connector Retail Limited Partnership ("GCCFC")
6	join in and consent to removal. Consent for the unnamed "Doe" defendants, CCP
7	382 defendants, and Gemini Investors LLC, is not required because their identities
8	are not known and, to the best of counsel's knowledge, none have been properly
9	served. <sup>2</sup> United Computer Sys., Inc. v. AT & T Corp., 298 F.3d 756, 762 (9th Cir.
10	2002) ("[T]he 'rule of unanimity' does not apply to 'nominal, unknown or
11	fraudulently joined parties ") (quoting <i>Emrich v. Touche Ross &amp; Co.</i> , 846 F.2d
12	1190, 1193, n.1 (9th Cir. 1988)). Gemini Defendants have been unable to contact
13	Defendants RBS Financial Products Inc. [f/k/a Greenwich Capital Markets, Inc.],
14	RBS Securities, Inc. [f/k/a Greenwich Capital Markets, Inc.], Greenwich Capital
15	Commercial Funding Bank or their counsel (collectively, "Greenwich
16	Defendants"), to ascertain whether they have been properly served. (Chatfield
17	Decl. ¶¶2-4.) Greenwich Defendants have not made an appearance in this case,
18	through counsel or otherwise. On September 16, 2014, counsel for Gemini
19	Defendants attempted to contact the service agents for Greenwich Defendants and
20	was unable to ascertain whether the Greenwich Defendants had been properly
21	served, whether they had retained counsel, or who to contact concerning this
22	litigation. ( $Id.$ , ¶ 2.) On September 17, 2014, counsel for Gemini Defendants spoke
23	1
24	Plaintiffs have erroneously named Bank of America Corporation fka LaSalle Bank National Association as Trustee for Greenwich Capital Commercial Funding
25	Corp., Commercial Mortgage Trust 2007 GG11, Commercial Mortgage Pass Through Certificates, Series 2007-GG11 as a defendant in this case. The proper
26	entity should be U.S. Bank N.A. as the Trustee.
27	<sup>2</sup> According to the Complaint, Plaintiffs have been unable to locate the Doe and CCP 382 Defendants. (Compl. ¶¶ 18-20.) Upon information and belief, Plaintiffs have been unable to serve or locate Gemini Investors LLC. (Declaration of Kellin
28	have been unable to serve or locate Gemini Investors LLC. (Declaration of Kellin M. Chatfield, ¶ 3.)  -3-
IIC)	_

DLA PIPER LLP (US) SAN DIEGO

1	with Plaintiffs' counsel, who stated that Greenwich Defendants had been served,	
2	but did not provide Gemini Defendants with proofs of service. Plaintiffs' counsel	
3	also stated they had not heard from any attorneys on behalf of Greenwich	
4	Defendants. (Id., ¶ 3.) Counsel for the Trust and GCCFC, Duane Morris LLP,	
5	also made repeated efforts to contact Kaye Scholer LLP, who, upon information	
6	and belief, may represent Greenwich Defendants. ( $Id.$ , ¶ 4.) These efforts	
7	included a phone call, multiple voicemails, and sending an email to the individual	
8	believed to be involved in representing Greenwich Defendants. (Id.)	
9	Consequently, Gemini, the Trust and GCCFC have been unable to ascertain	
10	whether Greenwich Defendants have been properly served and consent to removal	
11	is, therefore, not required. <i>Emrich</i> , 846 F.2d at 1193, n.1 (unanimity requirement	
12	applies only to those defendants who have been properly served).]	
13	Venue is proper in this Court because the United States District Court for the	
14	Central District of California embraces the county in which the state court action is	
15	now pending. See 28 U.S.C. §§ 84(c)(1), 1441(a).	
16	Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1446(d), Gemini Defendants filed this Notice of	
17	Removal concurrently with the state court in which the action is currently pending.	
18	In addition, a Notice of Filing Notice of Removal is being served on Plaintiffs'	
19	counsel.	
20	IV. <u>CONCLUSION</u>	
21	Accordingly, Gemini Defendants respectfully request that this action now	
22	pending against Defendants in the Superior Court of the State of California, County	
23	of Los Angeles, be removed to this Court and that this action be placed upon the	
24		
25		
26		
27		
28	///// WEST\250464095.1 -4-	

## 

1	docket of this Court for further proceedings as though originally instituted in this
2	Court.
3	Dated: September 24, 2014
4	DLA PIPER LLP (US)
5	
6	By s/Robert W. Brownlie ROBERT W. BROWNLIE
7	KELLIN M. CHATFIELD Attorneys for Defendants
8	GEMINI REAL ESTATE ADVISORS LLC; GEMINI EAST WEST S LLC;
9	GEMINI EAST WEST H, LLC; GEMINI EAST WEST M, LLC;
10	GEMINI ACQUISITION COMPANY, INC.; GEMINI PROPERTY
11	MANAGEMENT, LLC; GEMINI INVESTORS, LLC; WILLIAM T. OBEID; and DANTE A. MASSARO
12	OBEID; and DANTE A. MASSARO
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18 19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	WEST 2504/4005 1
P (US)	WEST\250464095.1 -5- NOTICE OF REMOVAL

DLA PIPER LLP (US)
SAN DIEGO